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Meeting of The Trust Steering Group 07 Jan 2025  
High Street, Tettenhall Village, WV6 8QT

**Attendees**

Neal Kelshaw (Chair | Director CIC) NK  
Robin Hacking (Chair, TCF)  
Matt Caffey (Treasurer | Director CIC)  
Paul Wilson (Resident)  
Steve Robinson (Business)  
Wendy Thompson (Co-opted Ward Councillor)  
Apologies: Nick Berriman, Jonathan Crofts, Sally Garner

**Agenda**

1. Rock Action Plan Complaint
2. Next Steps
3. Reports
4. AGM
5. AOB

**Minutes**

ACTIONS:

MC to confirm set up of web banking

NK to progress council determination with Ian Culley for neighbourhood area

RH & NK to draft Rock / Council complaint responses

NK to prepare constitution documents for consultation at TCF

1, Rock Action Plan Complaint;

A further complaint letter was submitted to Wolverhampton City Council complaints and Governance by NK on 18 Dec. This complaint escalated that the council has still not properly validated the stage 2 complaint of maladministration, and requested the following action, in line with the council complaints and petition process:

* Complaint validation with reference number
* Summary of next steps to manage the complaint
* Distribution of complaint correspondence to governance & ethics, opposition leaders office, as per complaints process guidelines
* Identification of conciliatory steps and mediation meeting
* The appointment of an external independent examiner to investigate the complaint, as per complaints process guidelines

The complaints process team have not responded validating or actioning any of the requested complaint handling actions and have not resolved to meet any mandatory requirements of the council complaints process for stage 2.

A further correspondence was received by Mr John Charles, of highways department, on 23 Dec 24. This correspondence outlined the following approach by the council;

[That an independent assessment and review was determined to be the most appropriate, open and effective way to progress this matter, and specifically address the safety issues and concerns]

“Your petition will be considered as part of the review commissioned to examine the potential options concerning traffic and safety issues at The Rock junction”

“The council does not accept there has been any maladministration in dealing with your petition, or that it has acted in bad faith”

“No decisions on the future of any proposals for The Rock Junction have been taken”

“The council’s stance on the proposed scheme remains unchanged”

“After requests from those, including ward councillors, to find a solution to the long standing issues at the junction, a detailed study, including traffic modelling was undertaken to assess the options…”

“Regarding concerns expressed in your recent communications, the information that you are seeking is available on the council’s consultation pages for the proposed scheme here: “

“The council remains committed to finding an evidence-based, informed solution to the issues and challenges arising in respect of The Rock junction… We will continue to engage directly with elected representatives, residents and stakeholders”

2, Next Steps

The steering group resolved that;

The response is unsatisfactory as the complaints process requirements have not been validated and progressed.

The highways department response is unsatisfactory as;

The council decided to merge its traffic proposals with our petition, the TDCT still requires a separate handling of the petition and adjudication on the complaint of maladministration.

The action plan and petition contain requests not appropriate to the outlined approach involving independent analysis, which must be progressed through different activity (which to date has not happened)

The scope of the independent analysis has previously been released following complaints of abuse of ICO “Not in public interest test” prior to a public question asked at full council meeting by Neal Kelshaw. That scope does NOT contain the details of our action plan or petition.

The scope also does NOT contain the details of concerns raised (and escalated to us) by other residents.

The process for validation of the scope was unacceptable as it does not allow verification of either TDCT action plans and petition, or residents issues raised.

Progress on the stage 2 complaint is still required on the aspects of maladministration already raised, and due to the unacceptable lack of veracity of the response received from the highways department, which while alluding to comply with our action plan and petition; is not competently specified to do so, and is not fit for purpose for at least those elements of our action which could be considered, but are not actually contained within the scope. Additionally, the action plan and petition contains elements which have so far not been given sufficient attention either directly through the petition scheme, or through subsequent complaints.

That it is appropriate to communicate directly with the cabinet members now responsible for this portfolio, since the council re-organisation, and that it is appropriate for a request to be made of a direct requirements consultation to be held with the independent consultants. Additionally, that further direct communications will continue with West Midlands Police Commissioner for the traffic abuse elements of the action plan, which should require co-operation of the council.

Further social media and trust communications to members will continue to highlight the unacceptable status of this process.

AP – RH and NK to draft next communications (RH – reply to highways, NK – further response to complaints, petition scheme and cabinet)

1. Reports

Ward Councillors - Councillor Thompson reported on her lobbying of the traffic situation at the last full council meeting on 5 Dec.

TCF – Consultation response is ongoing concerning Wolverhampton Local Plan, responses due 9 Jan.

1. AGM  
   The meeting resolved the scope of the AGM, which shall be held as advertised on 30 Jan 18:30 at South Staffs Golf Club

The scope is to consider promotion of the key aims, purpose and trust objectives, CIC purpose, and the roles of elected officials and resident officers, and committee structures, but is to adjourn until further EGM for elections.

NK to present on scope/purpose of planning and trust structure

MC to present on budget report and roles of directors (eg companies house guidance on 25% control)

RH to present on TCF work

1. AOB

NK to progress council application for neighbourhood forum/area.

There has been a donation to the Trust of more than £1,000 for the purpose of any neighbourhood wellbeing project initiative.

MC to ensure web banking access is working for Directors.
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Signed

Neal Kelshaw, Chair, Steering Group TDCT